DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 923 HE 029 928

AUTHOR Bledsoe, Gerie B.
TITLE Faculty Development in Higher Education. Enhancing a National Resource. To Promote Academic Justice and Excellence Series.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, DC. Office of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Decision Making; Educational Change; Educational Trends; *Faculty Development; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; Personnel Policy; Professional Autonomy; Retrenchment; School Policy; Skill Development; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *National Education Association

ABSTRACT

The National Education Association (NEA) believes that faculty development programs, if designed by the faculty, implemented on a voluntary and equitable basis, and adequately funded, can contribute to improving teaching and learning on college and university campuses. The ideal of continuing self-improvement by college and university faculty is a fundamental aspect of the profession. Calls for improved programs of faculty development include a range of activities from improving scholarship to enhancing teaching skills or revising curricula. Faculty development involves professional development, instructional development, personal development, curriculum development, and organizational development. The environment of American higher education is changing with greater student diversity, inadequate student preparation, shifts in student demand for courses from the liberal arts to business and technology, a knowledge explosion, large upward and downward changes in enrollment, and an aging profession with high departure rates and many new faculty. At the same time, general pressures for reform in higher education have accentuated the need for faculty development. State governments and institutions of higher education must define their roles in these efforts. Other issues relevant to faculty development include funding, a process for rewarding teaching, measures of effectiveness, and comprehensiveness. (Contains 27 references.) (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ED 404 923

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Faculty Development in Higher Education: Enhancing a National Resource

HE029 922

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

To Promote Academic Justice and Excellence

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Members Of The 1990-1991 NEA Standing Committee On Higher Education

VirginniaAnn G. Shadwick, Chairperson
San Francisco State University, California

Betty Cunningham
Gadsden Elementary School, North Carolina

Carolyn Gwaltney
Point Pleasant Elementary School, Maryland

Nina D. P. Horio
University of Hawaii

Roger Knutsen
Green River Community College, Washington

Kenneth Margerison
Southwest Texas State University

James F. Rice
Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

Bruce Romanish
St. Cloud State University, Minnesota

Shirley K. Rose
Patterson State Technical College, Alabama

Stan Schrader, Student Representative
University of Arkansas

Rance Thomas
Lewis & Clark Community College, Illinois

Gloria Wagener
Saginaw Valley State University, Michigan

Roy C. Weatherford
University of Southern Florida

Staff Liasions Kristeen Hanselman,
Director, Affiliate Services

Christine Maitland,
Coordinator for Higher Education

"The academic profession stands at a crossroads. Our colleges and universities, and society at large are faced with critical choices that must be made in the next few years. These decisions can lead toward a revitalized faculty fully capable of meeting its considerable responsibilities, or to neglect and perhaps irreparable damage to the nation."

—Bowen & Schuster, 1986

Contents

Preface Keith Geiger, NEA President ____ 5

Chapter 1 NEA Policy on Faculty Status and Development ____ 7

Chapter 2 Faculty Development: An Evolving Concept ____ 10

Chapter 3 The Power of Change ____ 13

Chapter 4 Status and Direction ____ 18

Chapter 5 What's the State's Role? ____ 19

Chapter 6 Institutional Activities ____ 20

Chapter 7 Issues for Faculty Development ____ 25

Chapter 8 Conclusions ____ 32

Notes ____ 33

References ____ 34

Appendix A Faculty Development Practices ____ 36

Appendix B For Further Reading ____ 37

Preface

Faculty development has been an important issue in higher education since the 1960s but remains a misunderstood term. A small number of faculty members concerned about educational quality use the term primarily to encourage improvements in college teaching and learning. These scholars have contributed significantly to what is known about good classroom practice in postsecondary institutions.

Yet, faculty development has negative implications at some colleges and universities; it suggests a need for remediation. For example, faculty members may be forced into a "development plan" following a negative evaluation by their administration. The faculty member's failure to make specified improvements according to that plan could lead to dismissal.

Therefore, many faculty members remain ambivalent about the concept of faculty development. They are aware that their institutions claim to have such plans, but they also know that these plans frequently include little beyond the traditional sabbatical or professional leave arrangements and, at most institutions, these programs are seriously under-funded. Most faculty are lucky if their institution provides a modest subsidy for travel to scholarly meetings.

The National Education Association believes that faculty development programs, if designed by the faculty, implemented on a voluntary and equitable basis, and adequately funded, can contribute to improving teaching and learning on college and university campuses. A review of NEA policy that addresses the issues of faculty development, status, and decision-making is included herein.

This booklet is one of seven in the *NEA To Promote Academic Justice and Excellence* series. *Faculty Development in Higher Education: Enhancing a National Resource*, provides recommendations to individuals and committees who are interested in, or confronted by, the concept of faculty development. It does not, however, constitute NEA policy except as explicitly noted.

Research for this booklet was conducted by the firm of Berman and Weiler, Berkeley, California. Gerie B. Bledsoe, Michigan State University, provided the policy analysis and authored the document. Editorial assistance was provided by Rebecca L. Robbins and Christine Maitland, NEA national staff.

We hope your concerns about faculty development are addressed in this booklet and ask that any questions and comments be directed to the NEA Office of Higher Education in Washington, D.C.

Keith Geiger
NEA President

Chapter 1.
NEA Policy on Faculty Status and Development

Between 1986 and 1989 a series of higher education policy statements was adopted by the National Education Association. The NEA policy statements supplemented existing policy and complemented the reform movement then sweeping the nation. Faculty development was referenced directly and indirectly in several of these statements, beginning with the relationship between the basic principles of academic freedom and the concept of faculty development. Subsequent statements addressed the relationships of faculty development, evaluation, and rewards. These statements serve as the basis for a set of policy recommendations that are included in this booklet.

The first and most fundamental NEA policy document, the Statement on Academic and Intellectual Freedom in Higher Education (1986), includes the following reference to faculty development:

> *Academic excellence and rejuvenation of the faculty may be enhanced by a variety of means without weakening the tenure system. Faculty development plans designed to encourage professional growth should be encouraged . . . These options should be implemented through joint action [of faculty representatives and the administration (The NEA 1991 Almanac of Higher Education*, 1991, p. 113)[1].

Thus an important NEA concern is that such plans are designed and implemented by "joint action" of the faculty and administration rather than by unilateral administrative actions. This joint action may be through collective bargaining or other decision-making processes where the faculty's recommendations are given appropriate weight.

NEA's statement on academic freedom also warns administrators against implementing systems of "post-tenure review" or faculty development schemes that force tenured faculty members to *prove*, continually or periodically, their competence.

In another draft NEA statement on the evaluation of faculty (1986), the term "faculty development" was not directly referenced. The draft statement acknowledges the faculty role but has been approved only for publication and discussion. The draft states:

> *Faculty bodies also establish and implement procedures for awarding sabbaticals, research support, and other awards and perquisites. . . . Faculty evaluation systems are designed to encourage faculty to improve the quality of their teaching, research, and service by suggestions and recommendations based on qualified, expert advice (NEA 1991 Almanac,* p. 118).

NEA believes that, because faculty development programs frequently include the award of sabbaticals, research support, travel funds, and other forms of support, full faculty participation in making these award decisions is considered imperative.

The faculty's primary role in establishing procedures to evaluate the work of colleagues is also underlined in NEA's 1986 *Statement on Faculty Governance* (*NEA 1991 Almanac*, p. 119). The 1986 NEA statement also references, in fact, the seminal 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, which was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors and the American Council of Education (American Association of University Professors, 1984, p. 105).[2] In their respective statements, NEA and AAUP assert that the role of faculty in making these decisions is a logical extension of their credentials, expertise, and experience.

At a later date, a special NEA commission separated the concept of faculty development from procedures that decide questions of faculty employment status. Faculty development issues were addressed in the budget section of the 1989 *Statement on Community College Governance: The Role of Faculty*:

> *Programs for the continuing development of the expertise, credentials, and experience of faculty must receive adequate funding. Faculty must agree to the existence and components of such programs, and may elect to participate. Faculty should allocate faculty development awards and sabbaticals (NEA 1991 Almanac,* p. 153).

The statement goes on to urge that faculty development plans, along with student evaluations of teaching, should be used only to aid and encourage professional growth and improve instruction. In other words, such plans should not be used to penalize or punish faculty members.

The following list of criteria for the design, implementation, and evaluation of faculty development plans emerges from these NEA policy statements. An appropriate faculty development plan should be:

- designed primarily by the faculty
- implemented through the joint action of faculty and administration
- voluntary for individual faculty members
- separate from personnel or faculty status decisions
- adequately funded
- fair and equitable
- administered by a faculty committee, such as the committee that awards sabbaticals and research grants
- evaluated by an appropriate, representative faculty body.

Chapter 2.
Faculty Development: An Evolving Concept

The ideal of continuing self-improvement by college and university faculty is a fundamental aspect of the ethos of the profession. Higher education faculty members are teachers, scholars, and researchers—members of a profession where learning should never cease. According to one statement on professional ethics:

> *Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth. . . . To this end they devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. . . . the professor seeks above all to be an effective teacher and scholar (AAUP Redbook,* p. 133).

To support this ideal, colleges and universities have long provided their faculty with opportunities to enhance their knowledge, improve their scholarship, and contribute new research findings.

Sabbatical leaves—the oldest form of faculty development—were introduced in the early 19th century in Eastern universities, probably first at Harvard (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 5). By the 1990s, most of the nation's major universities had instituted sabbaticals or other forms of paid leave. These programs had essentially one purpose—to facilitate travel, research, and publication. Concern with improving teaching was the exception.

This trend continued through the first half of the twentieth century. The primary purpose of sabbatical and other paid leaves remained research, writing, and study. Unpaid leaves were usually tied to specific research projects that required release time or travel subsidized by grant funds.

Other faculty development activities also began to appear. Workshops and special orientation sessions were offered to new faculty, while experienced faculty could usually obtain some financial support to defray the costs of travel to scholarly conferences. University colleges and departments sometimes held workshops on research topics and occasionally on instructional approaches. But there were as yet few comprehensive faculty development programs by the end of the 1960s.

Emerging concern for the quality of college teaching in the late 1960s, however, opened the way for bolder faculty development efforts. Several large universities created campus programs designed to help faculty improve curriculum and instruction. By the 1970s, faculty development had begun to take on a broader meaning, and development activities had begun to expand beyond the sabbatical tradition. Yet, studies conducted in the early 1970s by the American Council on Education found that only about 10 percent of institutions reported having programs designed to improve teaching, while 60 percent reported programs supporting faculty research. Within the space of a few years, faculty development activities proliferated. By 1976, almost half of the nation's two- and four-year institutions were funding some kind of separate campus faculty development unit.[3]

Most faculty development units were quite new—modestly funded and staffed—but a new pattern was emerging. By the mid 1970s, the concept of faculty development took on a positive connotation and was defined as any activity aimed at enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional growth of faculty members, particularly in their role as instructors (Gaff, 1975). By the mid-1980s, two-thirds of the nation's colleges and universities reported that they were sponsoring some type of faculty development program.

Today, the call for improved programs of faculty development encompasses diverse activities—from improving scholarship to enhancing teaching skills or revising curricula. There is no consensus among scholars on how to classify all activities or, for that matter, define terms like "faculty" and "professional development, retraining, renewal, and career development." Many faculty continue to fear that such plans are aimed at their remediation and, ultimately, their dismissal. Programs and efforts in this area often have had multiple purposes, leading to a confusing array of activities that are sometimes cited by institutional administrators as evidence of comprehensive approaches to institutional improvement.

CLASSIFICATION AND DEFINITION

The following classification system includes the more common forms of faculty development and might be used by faculty committees in considering or planning such activities.

Professional Development

This term includes activities aimed at improving scholarship, contributing knowledge to a field, or keeping current in a disciplinary area. These are the traditional goals of faculty

development, embracing activities such as scholarly research and publication, the presentation of professional papers, and similar efforts to develop and improve professional abilities.

Instructional Development

These are activities aimed at improving teaching skills, including understanding of student learning differences, course planning and organization, instructional methods, use of technology in the classroom, and student assessment procedures.

Personal Development

Activities and programs that seek to insure continuing faculty motivation, energy, and productivity over the course of an academic career, including personal stress counseling, training in interpersonal skills, or career planning workshops may be classified as personal development.

Curriculum Development

This classification includes activities designed to improve curriculum, including the preparation of new learning materials, development of new disciplinary or interdisciplinary courses, and redesign of the structure, content or pacing of existing courses.

Organizational Development

These are activities designed to create effective organizational environments for teaching and learning, including training in team building, conflict management, or problem-solving, or creation of a campus office to support faculty development (Gaff, 1975).

Chapter 3.
The Power of Change

Faculty and administrators at American colleges and universities are today confronted by powerful demographic, social, and economic developments and trends that appear to underscore the need for comprehensive faculty development plans.

CURRENT TRENDS

As the faculty, staff, and student populations of postsecondary campuses change, so must responses to them change. It is no secret that many higher education sytems are in financial difficulty. The question becomes one—not of money—of how to best respond to the challenges that lie ahead. Seven current trends are discussed below.

Greater Student Diversity

Growing numbers of "non-traditional" students—adults, ethnic minorities, immigrants, students from lower socioeconomic levels, and women—have enrolled in postsecondary education, and more are expected. Between 1973 and 1983, overall college attendance grew about 30 percent. At the same time, the growth in attendance for ethnic minorities was over 85 percent, and for students 25 to 34 years of age, almost 70 percent. Between 1970 and 1983, the enrollment of women grew 82 percent—more than half of total college enrollment—a trend that continues (National Center for Education Statistics, 1990).

These students, the faculty members of tomorrow, are demanding courses and curricula that reflect their racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, their experience and interests, and new perspectives on the cultures and civilizations of the world. No longer are they willing to accept a curriculum dominated by Western European civilization, as interpreted primarily by non-minority male faculty members. American higher education has faced such challenges in the past; it will face other demands for change in the future, as the discovery and dissemination of knowledge by teaching and scholarship continues to be in constant transformation.

Inadequate Student Preparation

Increasing numbers of students coming to college do not feel prepared for postsecondary work. Between 1971 and 1985, the number of college freshmen reporting they would need tutoring nearly doubled. Most scholars recognize that major

increases in funding of K-12 education and fundamental educational changes will be necessary before significant improvements in this area are made.

Shifts in Student Demand for Courses

Enrollments within institutions have shifted away from the liberal arts, social science, and humanities and into business, technology, and the professions. From 1971 to 1983, the award of bachelor's degrees in mathematics and foreign languages declined 50 percent, and in the social sciences 40 percent, while the number of engineering degrees increased more than 60 percent, and degrees awarded in business and management nearly doubled (ACE *Fact Book*, 1986-1987, p. 144).

The distribution of faculty among disciplines has not kept pace with these shifts. Tenured faculty in many areas have had to deal with declining enrollments, shrinking support budgets and research funds, and differential, market-driven salary policies that leave them behind.

Knowledge Explosion

Many fields have experienced a geometric increase in knowledge and information over the past few decades, accompanied by rapid progress in the development and use of new technologies. Keeping current with these developments has become a major challenge for faculty, made more difficult by the speed with which costly equipment and facilities become obsolete.

The Enrollment Roller Coaster

After the rapid enrollment increases (in the 1960's) caused by the "baby boomers," and the influx of non-traditional students during the 1970s and 1980s, undergraduate enrollments have leveled off at many institutions, and declined at others. Increases in enrollment of the "traditional" 18 year old will be slight over the next two decades.

Most predictions about adults returning to college-level education remain conservative, and graduate enrollments are also expected to decline or remain steady at best. The National Center for Education Statistics (1990) predicts that college enrollments will remain at current levels through 1994.

Corresponding declines in the demand for new faculty sharply decreased faculty mobility in the 1970s and 1980s. The annual turnover rate in tenure track positions slowed from about eight percent in the 1960s to less than two percent in the 1970s, and has not increased since then. However, the number of faculty expected to retire will soon be increasing signifi-

cantly at many institutions, especially research universities (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

The Aging Profession

Lower enrollments, less turnover among faculty, and a smaller demand for new faculty contribute to the aging of the professoriate. By the year 2000, more than half of the current faculty will be over 55 years old. As 1993 approaches and mandatory retirement ends, the question is how many faculty members will remain working beyond regular retirement age.

In a Congressionally-mandated report for the National Research Council, the Committee on Mandatory Retirement in Higher Education studied the impact of ending mandatory retirement for tenured faculty (Hammond & Morgan, 1991). The committee reviewed the retirement patterns nationwide and found that, in institutions without mandatory retirement, the proportion of faculty over age 70 was less than 1.6 percent. It concluded that "most faculty do not choose to work until age 70, although they have the opportunity to do so, and, overall, only a small number of the nation's tenured faculty will continue working in their current positions past age 70" (p. 29). The committee further stated that "higher education as a whole is likely to experience few changes in faculty behavior or demographics as a result of the elimination of mandatory retirement . . ." (p. 46).

With declines in real salaries and economic uncertainties, the financial security of retirement is dramatically reduced, especially considering the lack of early retirement programs. Many administrators worry, perhaps excessively, that because of the decline in financial security at retirement, older faculty may hold on to their positions longer and may be less energetic and productive than their younger colleagues.

The National Research Council report on mandatory retirement studied the relationship between growing older and productivity. The committe concluded that "measures of research activity show no strong relationship with age." Further, " . . . studies have not shown a clear decline of teaching ability with advancing age" (p. 58).

There may be other reasons for a decline in faculty members' performance. As the professoriate ages, many faculty report feeling immobilized in their profession, unable to advance their careers by moving to better positions at other institutions. Concern is growing that these feelings are leading to an increase in lower self-esteem, disengagement from work, and resistance to change and innovation (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 137).

Schuster (1989) finds that there has been a steady decline

in the quality of the academic workplace during the last two decades. Factors such as reduced secretarial support, crowded offices, reduced budgets, outmoded research equipment, and underprepared students have led many faculty to question the quality of the academic environment. Salary levels outpaced by inflation, a limited academic market, conflicting expectations regarding a deemphasis of teaching, and compressed career ladders have also resulted in environmental conditions that undermine "commitment and effectiveness" for faculty today (Schuster, 1989, pp. 63-64).

New Faculty

As current faculty members leave academe, new faculty will have to be hired to replace them. The need for faculty development programs during the next 25 years will greatly increase.

Bowen and Schuster in their 1986 study conclude that:

> *. . . on the average, from 1985 to 2009, as many as 70,000 to 130,000 new full-time faculty might be appointed during each five-year period. . . [That means that] over the next 25 years . . . the number of appointments will probably equal two-thirds or more of the entire faculty as of 1985* (pp. 197-198).

The Mellon Foundation funded a 1989 study, "Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences," that predicted severe faculty shortages in the arts and humanities. The most dramatic changes, the study finds, will begin to occur in 1997 when it is "projected that roughly four candidates will be available for every five openings in the arts and sciences and seven candidates for every 10 openings in the humanities and social sciences." The study cites the reason for the decline to be the drop-off in the number of people with doctorates in these fields and the availability of jobs outside academe for people with doctorates (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, September, 20, 1991).

The AAUP also predicts a shortage of faculty with doctorates between the mid-1990s and into the first decade of the next century:

> *These shortages are projected to occur for two reasons. First, the demand for faculty will increase due to increasing retirements from an aging professoriate and projected expansions in college enrollments. Second, while the number of doctorates granted by U.S. universities has remained roughly constant in recent years, nonacademic job opportunities are increasingly available to new and*

experienced doctorates. (Academe, March-April, 1991).

In preparing for the future faculty development needs to begin with doctoral students. Schuster (1989) acknowledges that while doctoral students usually receive good training in the substance and methods of their discipline, very few campuses have "enlightened training programs that expose teaching assistants to the techniques of effective teaching" (pp. 67). Schuster proposes that doctorate-granting institutions work with their departments of higher education to provide an understanding of an academic career for both prospective and current faculty in order to help them meet their "complex responsibilities" (Schuster, 1989, pp. 67-68).

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

These trends, coupled with America's need to remain competitive in a global economy, underlie demands from many quarters for a reexamination of teaching in higher education, and for more and better faculty development. That is, for activities, programs, and resources aimed at assisting faculty to improve their ability to teach and conduct research in a rapidly changing environment.

There are positive aspects of this growing recognition of the need for faculty development. Taken seriously and implemented effectively, faculty development can increase the vitality, professionalism, and stability of the profession.

There also are dangers. Faculty development, though chronically under-funded, may be tied to assessment programs in ways that might raise unrealistic expectations and demands on faculty. In short, faculty development might be one solution to the challenges facing higher education, or it might contribute to an increasingly difficult working environment for the profession.

Chapter 4.
Status and Direction

CALLS FOR QUALITY AND REVISION

General pressures for reform in higher education have accentuated the need for faculty development now and in the immediate future. The nation's colleges and universities clearly face growing demands for improvements in the quality of undergraduate education. At least a half-dozen national or regional commissions, study groups, associations or foundations have published reports since 1984 calling for major changes in higher education (see, for example, Boyer, 1984).

These reports have recommended that four-year colleges and universities place a much higher priority on instructional quality when structuring faculty incentive and reward systems, and that the undergraduate curriculum be broadly revised and strengthened to integrate disciplinary knowledge, focus in depth on basic subject areas, and prepare students to think critically and continue learning beyond college.

Most observers believe that such steps will require a serious investment in faculty development. Some statewide systems have taken or are contemplating steps involving faculty development, but most activity remains decentralized at the level of the individual college or university.

Chapter 5.
What Is the State's Role?

State legislatures and executive agencies have generally left the establishment and nurturing of faculty development programs to their institutions of higher education. In some states, the legislature has provided extra funds earmarked for these programs. Other states are considering such funding, or have promulgated principles or guidelines meant to stimulate their public colleges and universities to fund faculty development.

Most earmarked funding and other statewide requirements for faculty development apply to two-year colleges. For example, the Florida legislature at one point established a funding formula under which two percent of the prior year's community college budget was devoted to faculty and program development. In California, there is a voluntary program under which community colleges allocate up to 15 instructional days to engage faculty and staff in faculty development from their regular state appropriations. A recent study conducted by the California Community College Chancellor's Office found that "since the inception of the program, the number of Community Colleges choosing the flexible calendar option has increased dramatically. In 1991-92, ninety-five colleges are expected to be on flex" (Flexible calender: Evaluation and Title 5 revision, 1991, p. 1).

Alabama has required community colleges to take three days for faculty development in the fall and spring semesters. Kentucky also mandates faculty development for community colleges. In that state, where community colleges are part of the university system, five percent of faculty time must be allocated to faculty development, and faculty are held accountable for their development activities during promotion and tenure reviews. Schuster, Wheeler, & Associates (1990, pp. 167-254) provide other examples of state requirements for faculty development.

Thus, states have begun to play a somewhat larger role in funding or requiring faculty development for community college faculty. Some observers believe that more state involvement can be expected. Others, however, feel that statewide faculty development policies will remain quite limited in the forseeable future. A tendency to link student assessment, curriculum or institutional evaluation, and faculty development programs may be a source of major problems for faculty and their organizations in the future.

Chapter 6.
Institutional Activities

Most two- or four-year institutions of higher education report that they provide opportunities for faculty development. Indeed, there has been a reported proliferation of practices, activities, and types of programs. One recent study identified 37 different faculty development practices at a group of Midwestern universities and colleges, and the list was not exhaustive (Schuster, et al., 1990 p. 254).

A list of categories of practices most commonly found on college and university campuses today, which gives examples of each type of practice, is included at the end of this booklet. (Appendix A) These activities range from releasing faculty from teaching duties to providing information and funding support for research, curriculum development, or improved teaching practices.

OPPORTUNITIES AND FUNDING

In 1990, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported the results of their national study of academic departments, which included opportunities for professional development, in *A Descriptive Report of Academic Departments in Higher Education Institutions.* The most common activities funded were professional travel and sabbaticals, followed in decreasing order of support by funding for the improvement of teaching skills, for training to improve research skills, retraining, for membership in professional organizations, and for paid leave for gaining work experience. The study found differences in support within the categories between two- and four-year institutions.

The following outline summarizes what the study found concerning the availability within departments of the various types of funding:

- Sabbaticals
  - four-year institutions - 92%
  - two-year institutions - 77%

- Improvement of teaching skills
  - four-year institutions - 75%
  - two-year institutions - 84%

- Improvement of research skills
  four-year institutions - 67%
  two-year institutions - 46%

- Retraining for higher demand fields
  four-year institutions - 39%
  two-year institutions - 33%

- Membership in professional associations
  four-year institutions - 34%
  two-year institutions - 31%

- Paid leave for work experience
  four-year institutions - 29%
  two-year institutions - 22%

The study also found that professional development opportunities for part-time faculty are significantly less than for their four-year colleagues. More than 50 percent of the departments in both two-year and four-year schools do not provide professional development opportunities for part-time faculty.

FACULTY EVALUATION AND PARTICIPATION

Faculty participation in development activities may be influenced by the outcome of evaluations that occur during the review of probationary faculty for tenure. Evaluations of tenured faculty, such as classroom evaluations by students, may encourage senior colleagues to seek assistance with their classroom practices. Feedback about one's teaching performance or research productivity can be a powerful incentive to improve.

At relatively few institutions, and at some schools or departments within campuses, faculty development is required. For example, a few institutions require faculty to have three-year "growth plans." During periodic reviews, faculty are evaluated according to how well they have met the goals in their "growth plan." But this form of mandatory faculty development is the rare exception to the voluntary approach followed on most campuses.

With the expansion of faculty development beyond traditional sabbatical leaves in the late 1960s, colleges and universities began to create professional development centers or programs directed by campus and system administrators. These centers or programs typically provide or administer grants to faculty for curriculum or instructional improvement, disseminate information on grant opportunties, offer direct services in the form of evaluation and consultation on teaching

and curriculum, or offer assistance with the preparation of grant applications.

Examples of faculty development programs that appear to have a positive impact—careful evaluations by independent agencies are rare—are becoming more common. The Center for Teaching Effectiveness, University of Texas at Austin, for example, was established in 1973 by the Faculty Senate in order to promote effective teaching. The Center offers personal consultations about improving teaching (including the use of videotaping), interdepartmental conferences, workshops, and a newsletter. Faculty members voluntarily participate in conducting various Center activities, and teaching assistants are required to have training in teaching. A similar center exists at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville.

Miami-Dade Community College provides an illustration of an integrated faculty development program in a two-year college. In addition to a range of workshops, grants, research projects, and off-campus seminars and conferences, the Faculty, Staff and Program Development Office at Miami-Dade works with faculty to formulate ways to implement various reform programs—a performance-based curriculum—underway at the college (see McCabe & Jenrette, 1990, pp. 181-198 for further discussion of the Miami-Dade program).

Despite these innovations, however, the most commonly offered services and activities today remain those that have dominated faculty development programs for the last twenty years: sabbaticals, release time, workshops, travel money for conference attendance, and mini-research grants.

INSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The nature of these activities and, more importantly, the needs for faculty development differ according to the size, mission, and culture of the institution. To help structure faculty discussion of these activities and needs, institutional arrangements might be considered to fall into three broad categories, based on institutional mission.

Doctoral-Granting Research Universities

At these universities, faculty development practices remain heavily weighted toward the support of research and scholarship. Research is widely considered to be a major component of the faculty's job, but its support is rarely treated as an explicit faculty development activity. These institutions usually emphasize sabbatical leaves, research grants, and support for travel to conferences.

Although the reform movement has created a growing concern for improving teaching, faculty incentives at this level

are largely based on research activites and publication. Opportunities for improving teaching are voluntary, and rewards are minimal. Special attention is currently given at more institutions to newer faculty and graduate students (Teaching Assistants) who teach many of the undergraduate courses. Some graduate schools—including Harvard and Stanford—are implementing programs to prepare graduate students to be better teachers in their new faculty positions.

Four-year, Teaching-Research Colleges and Universities

At a growing number of state colleges, "regional" universities, and larger private institutions, the primary mission of teaching has been threatened or supplanted by the "publish or perish" requirements of research. It might be argued that the "surplus" of Ph.D.s in the 60s and 70s, and the unbridled ambition of certain administrators has lead to an unnecessary emphasis on research mission at teaching institutions, thus creating the stressful situation of having the faculty carry heavy teaching loads while being required to publish.

In the 1990 Carnegie Foundation report, *Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities of the Professoriate*, Ernest Boyer reports on a nationwide study of faculty. In response to a question about publishing in order to obtain tenure, 43 percent—compared with six percent in 1969—of the respondents at the four-year institutions said it was necessary for tenure. This represents a tremendous workload increase during this time for faculty at these institutions.

At these same institutions, both research support and instructional improvement are considered faculty development areas. Release time from teaching one or more courses is the most common form of faculty development, and there is a growing trend to provide a reduced teaching load for new, non-tenured faculty. The stress in attempting to accomplish both research and good teaching has resulted in reported severe personal problems, and faculty leaders have suggested that this situation is unstable and must change in the future.

Teaching Colleges

At community and junior colleges and small private liberal arts colleges, teaching effectiveness is reportedly the principal criterion for promotion and tenure. Faculty development is primarily concerned with improving instructional skills, though some colleges provide support for helping faculty remain current in their scholarship. Workshops, seminars, faculty leaves, and other activities on these campuses focus on instructional techniques and curricular development. Innovations in teaching are probably pursued more actively at community and junior colleges than at four-year colleges and

universities, because of the greater diversity of community and junior college students.

At all levels of institutions, the introduction of more instructional technologies—interactive computer programs, two-way interactive TV, multi- and hyper-media, and other forms of distance learning—will require some faculty to develop additional skills. Many faculty members in the future will attain "superstar" status because of their skill and ability to project themselves or teach via electronic media.

Chapter 7.
Issues for Faculty Development

Faculty development has become an accepted part of the culture of many institutions of higher education, but four basic needs face the profession: funding, recognition of good teaching, effectiveness or usefulness, and comprehensiveness.

FUNDING

There is a dire need for more funding and increased effectiveness. A review of existing faculty development programs leads to contradictory findings. First, there has been a trend toward institutionalizing faculty development programs and a general acceptance of the need for such programs in higher education. At the same time, many individual programs are being discontinued, and funding has been reduced at other institutions over the last decade. Moreover, although no comprehensive data exist on expenditures for faculty development, faculty leaders believe that the current level of resources devoted to this area is woefully inadequate (Schuster, Wheeler, et al., pp. 3-4).

While faculty development has gained acceptance at many institutions, it retains a low priority when hard budget choices are made. There may be strong pressure in coming years to abandon faculty development programs and funding altogether—with no lessening of the demands for improved teaching in research institutions and for more research in teaching institutions.

To support faculty development, more institutions are seeking support from sources external to the college or university. These are primarily foundation grants, federal funds, and corporate equipment grants, or in-kind contributions. Often such support is sought because internal or public resources for faculty development are scarce and vulnerable during periods of financial stringency.

External funding may become an even more important source of seed money and start-up support for new programs, particularly because it is often the best way to nurture experimental activities. Outside funding and equipment are sometimes easier to obtain, are often available sooner than internal funding, and can have the virtue of reducing disputes over resource allocation by being earmarked for the support of particular programs.

Some external support, however, can come with unwelcome strings attached. Outside funding can be criticized as

occasionally conditioning faculty not to pursue worthwhile development activities unless monetary rewards such as honoraria or stipends are made available. Another danger is the creation of private foundations, even by community colleges, into which public funds are transferred, directly or indirectly, and expended for purposes neither disclosed nor discussed in the academic community.

On the other hand, the allocation of new internal resources from the regular budget of the institution can be an important symbol of institutional commitment and priorities. Where such a commitment is meant seriously, the provision of internal resources can be a way of institutionalizing support for important new programs, and can provide the stability of funding over time that is usually required if programs are to improve and mature. Programs funded with internal support tend, it can be argued, to be more accountable and managed more carefully.

In light of scarce resources, most faculty development activities provide support or services only to a limited number of faculty. These activities therefore may have marginal effects on the institution, even if the programs are effective for the relatively few faculty they reach. Moreover, it may be that faculty who are most in need of development activities are also least prone to participate. Some institutions try to reinforce those institutional norms that encourage and reward participation in faculty development activities, and deprive faculty—who make no effort to improve—of collegial acceptance and symbols of institutional approval. Some community and junior colleges also link steps on their salary schedules to additional coursework in their fields or improvements in teaching skills.[4]

The risk in adopting the latter policy—of linking extrinsic rewards to participation in faculty development activities rather than to desired outcomes such as improved curriculum or better teaching—is that participation could become a pro forma exercise. It could be seen only as a way of satisfying a requirement for a positive performance evaluation or a promotion. Participation without genuine involvement and commitment would be unlikely to foster improvements in curriculum or instruction.

Examples of existing programs that follow cost-effective strategies are rare. One example, drawn from the California State University at Long Beach, involved a program that trains deans and department chairs to employ effective faculty development practices, based on research conducted with faculty at the campus. By training operational administrators whose roles and responsibilities include contact with faculty, the program tried to form a cadre of faculty development agents who could assist their colleagues.

Administrators and faculty representatives need to supplement their strategy of seeking more funding with more creative and effective programs. Faculty committees can play a key role in designing faculty development programs where institutional funds are used fairly and effectively.

REWARDING TEACHING

There is a need to reward teaching excellence in higher education. Too often faculty are evaluated for tenure and promotion primarily on their research and publication activities—not for teaching excellence. Colleges and universities have been increasingly criticized for neglecting their teaching function and focusing attention on research and publication. Seldin (1990) sees this as a "fact of academic life" (p. 3) and argues that institutions often think prestige is enhanced by recruiting scholars rather than teachers:

> *Teaching is largely a private affair that goes on between a professor and students behind a closed classroom door. The results of research are published and become a matter of public discussion. It is not surprising that colleges and universities set a greater store by research and fail to reward even outstanding teaching performance. An institution that does otherwise goes against the tide (p. 5).*

Seldin's recommendations for a more responsive teaching environment on campus include: making teaching *quality* important in salary, tenure, and promotion decisions; broadening the *definition of scholarship* to include transmitting knowledge to students; expanding *student evaluations* of courses to improve teaching techniques; and employing a *comprehensive program* of personal and professional development [emphasis added] (pp. 10-11).

Seldin also cites institutions that currently reward effective teaching like Miami-Dade Community College, Haverford College (Pennsylvania), University of Georgia, University of Redlands (California), Pace University (New York), Ball State University (Indiana), Trenton State College (New Jersey), and University of Denver Business School.

Boyer, in his 1990 report, also recommends that the definition of scholarship be broadened and argues that students are losing out: "[the] reality is that on far too many campuses, teaching is not well rewarded, and faculty who spend too much time counseling and advising students may diminish their prospects for tenure and promotion" (*pp.XI–XII*). Boyer also recommends that a new definition of scholarship include the "scholarship of teaching" (pp. 24-25).

EFFECTIVENESS

The effectiveness of instructional improvement plans needs to be increased. Faculty development programs aimed at enhancing instruction are now in place at the majority of American colleges and universities, but many of these programs have had disappointing or very limited results. One reason for this slight impact is the limited resources devoted to their support. However, another often unacknowledged reason is that many instructional improvement programs simply are not effective.

What is needed in order to establish effective programs? There are no simple ways to assure fair and effective programs, but the following recommendations drawn from reports from faculty leaders about instructional improvement programs at their institutions may provide some guidance:

Faculty should be directly involved in program planning and implementation. The primary responsibility for professional development lies with the individual faculty member. Effective programs obtain the voluntary participation of the faculty they hope to reach by emphasizing faculty ownership and initiative from program inception through all stages of program execution.

Differences among disciplines should be recognized and accommodated. Astutely designed programs (particularly at universities) recognize the different cultures and values of the disciplines, and design development activities that take these differences into account. Faculty are encouraged to make research and teaching mutually supportive, and faculty members' deepest intellectual commitments are taken seriously.

Development assistance should be tailored to faculty career stages. New faculty often need assistance in instructional techniques and in getting oriented to their schools and departments. They may also need help in making connections with their senior colleagues and in understanding their institutions' expectations and opportunities. Studies of faculty career stages also indicate that many faculty members develop a stronger interest in teaching during the last half of their careers, and could also benefit from participation in instructional development activities.

Mentoring programs during the first year or two of teaching for new faculty members, especially minorities, are considered imperative to increase significantly their chances of success.[5]

Programs should identify and include effective leaders. When instructional improvement programs are initiated, key decision-makers should be identified and involved in program

planning, then kept informed throughout the process. Leadership can come from administrators, faculty with formal leadership roles (committee chairs, department heads, association officials, etc.), or unofficial faculty leaders. When leadership is shared between faculty and administrators, programs are more likely to succeed.

Both individual and group activities should be supported. Most instructional development programs are geared toward individual development. While individual opportunities are important, teaching improvement programs should also encourage colleagues of similar and different ranks, ages, and disciplines to work together and help each other. These programs are most effective when they combine individual activities with institutional activities such as faculty seminars, workshops, and lectures, interdisciplinary programs, mentoring, and team teaching. Such group experiences expose faculty members to new perspectives, and could improve collegiality and lend respect to faculty development. If they work well, these efforts could create networks of teachers who can support each other and strengthen expectations for quality instruction throughout an institution.

Programs should have adequate administrative support. Successful programs require a departmental, campus, and system-wide commitment to better teaching. Programs have a higher likelihood of working when they are clearly central to the university or college, are strongly supported by senior management, and are highly visible. Administrators can demonstrate their support by providing financial help, by showing a genuine interest in program outcomes, by personally seeing to it that programs are well-managed, by initiating new programs and activities, by giving faculty clear signals about what is expected of them, and by assuring that faculty efforts are appreciated and rewarded.

At institutions where the faculty is represented by a collective bargaining agent, it is recommended that the procedures for faculty development be worked out at the bargaining table or by a faculty-administrative committee reporting to the bargaining teams. It is especially important that the collective bargaining contract speaks to the relationship between faculty development and any negative personnel action that might result from a faculty member's participation or failure to participate in a development program. Many faculty bargaining teams would prefer to preclude any disciplinary action from arising out of a faculty development plan and keep the latter as a completely voluntary activity by faculty members.

COMPREHENSIVENESS

There is a growing need for comprehensive "career" development. Virtually all faculty development programs that have been initiated in response to pressures of the last few decades have been oriented toward enhancing instructional or research skills. The third part of a comprehensive approach to faculty development—personal and career development—has not received adequate attention, particularly in light of predictable future trends (Schuster et al., 1990, p. 65).

The service and information-based sectors of the American economy are creating diverse jobs, with a significant expansion of the need for retraining and life-long education. Employees and business people alike will need to possess a high level of general competence, including the ability to learn, to solve problems, and to adapt to changing working conditions. New jobs in high technology areas will require new skills. These developments are stimulating the use of technology in education, increasing the importance of a strong general education for all students, while requiring students to use the technological tools of the new workplace—computers and other telecommunication devices. At the same time, student populations are growing more diverse, many students are coming to college inadequately prepared, and student interests have shifted away from general education and toward employment–based specialties.

The speed and breadth of these changes will place new demands on higher education faculty—to keep up with new technological developments and insure that all students obtain a solid general education. For some faculty, it may require actual retraining; for others, it means having to cope with a changed and possibly stressful environment.

The academic profession has long had its share of stress. But the pressures described above are likely to accelerate such faculty problems as "burn out," alienation, mid-career crises, and loss of currency and productivity. The need for programs designed to treat both the professional and personal dimensions of these issues is more apparent. More activities such as counseling, fitness programs, and efforts to facilitate collegial support, such as mentoring, will be imperative (Schuster, et al., pp. 106, 123).

Summary

To be successful, faculty development programs need adequate funding and a general recognition of the critical importance of good teaching. Development programs must be recognized as effective and useful. They should also be seen as comprehensive—addressing the various needs of college

teacher/scholars over their entire careers.

However, faculty development plans, if they are to be universally accepted, must contend with a growing list of professional and individual considerations:

- steady-state or loss of faculty positions
- less career mobility vs. the need for more mobility
- mid-career inertia or career redirection
- high tenured rate
- elimination of mandatory retirement
- tenure pressures on new faculty (fewer slots, higher or changing standards)
- changing disciplines and new technologies
- institutional refocus or retrenchment
- demands for assessment

In contrast to these pressures, the current availability of personal development or support opportunities for faculty is limited, and there is inadequate awareness of how seriously personal or career problems can affect scholarship and instruction. Much more by way of research needs to be done here if one of the nation's most vital resources—college faculty—is to be rescued.

Chapter 8. Conclusions

The challenge for faculty leaders and administrators is to establish, fund, administer, and evaluate programs to encourage and support the professional development and career growth of faculty and staff. As pressures on the faculty and their institutions increase, the need for such programs will grow, and higher education institutions will have to find the resources, incentives, and administrative acumen to make them work. This will be no small task given what is a stake—the academic life and careers of a major proportion of the nation's brain trust.

The National Education Association believes that increased investment in the development of the nation's greatest resource—its teachers at all levels and those who support teaching and learning—is imperative. This development process should be continued throughout a teacher/scholar's career. It should be nurturing and never threatening; flexible and appropriate for the individual. Such actions must be based on the premise that professionals are trained to know what is best for them, and will make the best choice when afforded reasonable alternatives.

Above all, the procedural criteria set forth in the beginning of this booklet should be followed to ensure that faculty development programs are supportive, effective, and fair. A good development plan will ultimately attract voluntary faculty participation, even if the range of enthusiasm will always be broad.

A punitive plan will be, and should be, resisted as having a potentially chilling effect on academic freedom, professional prerogatives, and tenure. However, given enough time and adequate resources, most faculty leaders and administrators will be able to agree on appropriate, long-term faculty development programs for their institutions if they approach the effort with the mutual trust and respect for each other and the principles involved necessary for sound institutional governance.

NOTES

[1] *The NEA 1991 Almanac of Higher Education* will hereafter be referred to as *NEA 1991 Almanac*. The National Education Association's higher education policy is published annually in *The NEA Almanac of Higher Education*. Additions and modifications in policy are initiated by the NEA Standing Committee on Higher Education, and approved by the Board of Directors and/or Representative Assembly.

[2] *The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* will hereafter be referred to as the *AAUP Redbook*.

[3] These data are drawn from the *Fact Book on Higher Education*, which is published annually by the American Council on Education (ACE), hereafter called the *ACE Fact Book*. These data are collected by the ACE, the Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education, and other sources.

[4] At least one Midwestern community college, where the faculty is not represented by a bargaining agent, awards faculty an increase of $65 in base salary for each hour of graduate credit taken in their field. The college has the normal increments for degrees. This college and others, however, have trouble when trying to decide what type of non-credit courses, workshops, or in-service training might be substituted for credit courses.

[5] In 1990, the National Education Association and the American Association of University Professors approved a joint statement entitled, "Mentoring to Increase Minority Participation in Higher Education—The Faculty's Role."

References

American Association of University Professors. (1991, March-April). The annual report on the economic status of the profession. *Academe*.

American Association of University Professors. (1984). *Policy documents and reports*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (1986-1987). *Fact Book on Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Baldwin, R., Brakeman, L. Edgerton, R., Maher T., Hagberg, J. (1981) *Expanding faculty options: Career development projects at colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Bowen, H. R., Schuster, J. H. & Associates. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. (1984). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Harper and Row.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered, priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Princeton, N. J.

California Community College Chancellor's Office. (1991, July 11-12). *Flexible calender: Evaluation and Title 5 revisions* (First Reading, Action Pending, September Board Meeting). Sacramento: Author.

Eble, K. E. & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Gaff, J. G. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Hammond, P.B. & Morgan, H. P. (Eds.). (1991). *Ending mandatory retirement for tenured faculty: The consequences for higher education* (Committee on Mandatory Retirement in Higher Education for the National Research Council). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Jennings, C., & Barlar, A. D. *Renewed Interest in Faculty Development Encourages an Institutional Approach to Planning.* Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 1990 8 (Summer) pp. 69–74.

McCabe, R. H. & Jenrette, M. S. (1990). Leadership in action: A campuswide effort to strengthen teaching. In P. Seldin & Associates (Eds.), *How administrators can improve teaching* (pp. 181-198). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1990). *Targeted Forecast* (NCES 90-689). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1990) *A descriptive report of academic departments in higher education institutions* (NCES 90-339). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Education Association. (1991). *The NEA 1991 almanac of higher education.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

Seldin, P. & Associates. (1990). *How administrators can improve teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schuster, J. H. (1989). The personal dimension: Faculty development. *Thought & Action,* 5(1), 61-72.

Schuster, J. H., Wheeler, D. W. & Associates). (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Appendix A: Faculty Development Practices

Practice	Examples
Releasing faculty from teaching duties	• Sabbatical Leaves • Short-term unpaid leaves • Release time
Providing direct funding support	• Research grants • Travel grants for conference attendance • Fund to purchase materials or equipment • Summer grants for projects to improve instruction • Awards for excellence in teaching • Payment of fees for attending off-campus courses
Providing information	• Workshops on student assessment techniques • Lectures by visiting scholars in disciplinary areas • Seminars on career planning • Newsletters emphasizing grant opportunities • Conferences on the uses of instructional technology
Providing personal evaluation and assistance	• Senior faculty acting as mentors • Administrative and peer evaluation and recommendations on teaching practices • Specialist consultations on use of audio-visual aids • Personal counseling on career goals

For Further Reading

Most literature on faculty development is reflective or prescriptive essays by experienced analysts, based on their study of materials from institutions with faculty development programs, conversations with faculty and administrators, or personal experience. Few independent evaluations of faculty development programs have been conducted, and most have relied on reports by faculty participants rather than measures of actual outcomes. (A number of analysts have argued that desired outcomes—professional or personal growth—are not susceptible to reliable measurement, and that evaluations would therefore have little meaning.) Quantitative analyses have been conducted on student and faculty demographic trends, and the literature on aging, stages of adult development, and personal and professional vitality is grounded in a solid research tradition.

The following publications have been cited in the reference section of this booklet. We have annotated the entries below to provide the reader with a brief overview of some influential works covering a variety of approaches to faculty development.

Baldwin, R.G., & Blackburn, R.T., (Eds.), (1983). *College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

This collection of eight essays focuses on how attention to faculty resources can help to preserve educational vitality during periods of fiscal constraint. The essays discuss the benefits and complexities of faculty development, review sources of data on the condition of the professoriate, and consider the question of future demand for college professors. Key chapters also discuss strategies for faculty renewal in light of the literature on aging, and review faculty development practices that seem to have the greatest positive impact.

Clark, S.M., & Lewis, D.R., (Eds.), (1985). *Faculty vitality and institutional productivity: Critical perspectives for higher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

This book presents analyses of how faculty career development relates to professional vitality and institutional productivity. After an introductory chapter that discusses theoretical and conceptual issues, a major section of the book deals with key empirical findings, including trends in faculty demography, the theory and practice of faculty career development, and the relationship between aging and productivity. A third section then explores a number of policy options for

maintaining faculty vitality, including faculty development, mid-career changes, outside consulting, collective bargaining, and early retirement. In a final chapter, the editors discuss the issues presented by the book's authors and review alternative institutional strategies.

Eble, K.E., & McKeachie, W.J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Two senior researchers in the field present an evaluation of faculty development programs supported by the Bush Foundation at 18 small private colleges, 15 state college or state university campuses in Minnesota and the Dakotas, and at the Universities of Minnesota and North Dakota. The evaluation is preceded by a review of the history of faculty development in higher education, with particular attention to recent efforts. The institutions and faculty development programs in the study are then described, and a number of case studies presented. Three chapters then present the authors' analysis of the effectiveness of faculty development, based on the data they collected. The last two chapters discuss evaluation methods and provide overall conclusions.

Gaff, J.G. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

In this influential study completed in the mid-70s, the author explores the new approaches to instructional improvement that were then beginning to become important. Detailed discussions are provided of the meaning of faculty, instructional, and organizational development, and the ways in which they are complementary. These discussions are followed by chapters that describe how colleges and universities organize and structure instructional improvement programs, and address issues of program politics, financing, and staffing. The book concludes with an assessment of program impacts on faculty, students, and institutions, and a discussion of future needs.

Nelson, W.C. (1981). *Renewal of the teacher scholar: Faculty development in the liberal arts college.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

The author was director of the Project on Faculty Development of the Association of American Colleges; this book is based on interviews and observations he conducted with more than 500 persons—mostly faculty members—at twenty liberal arts colleges around the country. Following a discussion of the need for continuing personal and institutional renewal, the book describes four different aspects of renewal—

professional development, instructional development, curricular change, and organizational development. These chapters are followed by sections that discuss key issues of implementation, including program planning and administrative support.

Schuster, J.H., & Bowen, H.R. (1985). The faculty at risk. *Change, September/October*, 13-21.

The authors review changes since the early 70s in faculty working conditions and compensation that they believe are eroding morale and jeopardizing the quality of higher education. They charge that campus reward systems have indiscriminately triggered a substantial shift in values, toward upgrading the importance of research and undercutting the importance of effective teaching. They charge that faculty are more narrowly specialized and segmented, with junior faculty becoming more isolated; that recent reform proposals have not taken into account the weakened morale and commitment of the liberal arts faculty; and that academic careers are become less attractive to prospective recruits. The article is based on a 1989 book-length study entitled *American professors: A national resource imperiled* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Schuster, J.H., Wheeler, D.W. & Associates. (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. A collection of essays by the big names in the field of higher education, the table of contents reflects the changes that have taken place over the past two decades, i.e. expansion of the term "faculty development" from the early emphasis on improving teaching to the concept of career development linked to organizational development, including wellness programs.

Weiner, M. (1990). *Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing instructional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Despite growing concern for the quality of higher education, many institutions, while encouraging faculty to enhance their knowledge of subject matter, do not support their efforts to improve such facets of instruction as course organization or initiation of classroom discussion. This book describes how colleges and universities can provide faculty with the resources, support, and incentives that will promote teaching improvement.

Weimer outlines how administrators, deans, department heads, and faculty development professionals can create an environment that fosters teaching excellence. The author presents in-depth case studies of improvement programs implemented at a variety of colleges to reveal the techniques administrators can use to facilitate improvement throughout their institutions.

nea

BEST COPY AVAILABLE